REMARKS

Claims 1-10 remain in the application, claim 9 having been amended. Responsive to the Restriction Requirement stated in paragraph 1 of the Office action, applicants elect Group I, Claims 1-8 for examination. This election is made with traverse.

The examiner has justified the restriction requirement on the grounds that the inventions are subcombinations usable together, and the standard for restriction requires that it be shown that they do not overlap in scope, are not obvious variant, and at least one subcombination is separately usable. The examiner maintains that the method of providing an operator selection service (claim 1) is usable separately from the network for provision of an operator selection service (claim 9). The example given is that the method has a separate utility such as communication between a local exchange and a call server when a call is to pass to a second operator, but this ignores the introductory language of each of claims 9 and 10 which recite operator selection. Claim 9 has now been amended to clarify that it also selects between first and second operators. Each of claims 10 describes the establishment of a connection over a defined communication channel of an assigned connection loop determined in the connection request message. So all of the claims are describing the establishment of a connection over a determined connection. It is further submitted that there is no serious burden in examining both together, since neither can be examined properly without considering the other in any event.

Applicant reserves the right to file a Divisional Application directed to non-elected claims 9-10.

Respectfully submitted,

/DJCushing/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

David J. Cushing
Registration No. 28,703

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 4, 2006